

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/004,318 | 11/02/2001 | John Joseph King | LF101US | 8272 | |
| 7590 11/20/2003 | | | EXAMINER | | |
| John J. King | | | NGUYEN, DUC M | | |
| 1481 Cantigny Wheaton, IL | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 2685 | 16 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003 | , /3 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 10/004,318

Applicant(s)

King et al

Examiner

Duc M. Nguyen

Art Unit **2685**



| | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears | s on the cover s | sheet with | the correspondence address |
|--|---|--|-------------------------------|---|
| Period ' | for Reply | | | |
| | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SE | T TO EXPIRE _ | 3 | _ MONTH(S) FROM |
| - Extens | MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. sions of time may be evailable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). If up date of this communication. | In no event, however, | , may a reply l | be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the |
| - If the p - If NO p - Failure - Any re | period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply a to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | y and will expire SIX (the application to be | (6) MONTHS for come ABANDO | from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |
| Status | | | | |
| 1) 💢 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 12, | 2003 | | |
| 2a) 💢 | This action is FINAL . 2b) This action | ction is non-fina | al. | |
| 3) 🗆 | Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Ex particle. | • | | • • |
| Disposi | ition of Claims | | | |
| 4) 💢 | Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> | | | is/are pending in the application. |
| 4 | 4a) Of the above, claim(s) | _ | | is/are withdrawn from consideration. |
| 5) 🗆 | Claim(s) | | | is/are allowed. |
| 6) 💢 | Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> | | | is/are rejected. |
| 7) 🗆 | Claim(s) | | | is/are objected to. |
| 8) 🗆 | Claims | aı | re subject | to restriction and/or election requirement. |
| Applica | ation Papers | | | |
| 9) 🗆 | The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | |
| 10) | The drawing(s) filed on is/are | re a) 🗌 accept | ted or b)[| \square objected to by the Examiner. |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the | drawing(s) be h | neld in abe | yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). |
| 11) | The proposed drawing correction filed on | i: | s: a) 🗌 a | approved b) \square disapproved by the Examiner. |
| | If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply | / to this Office a | action. | |
| 12) | The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam | niner. | | |
| Priority | under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 | | | |
| 13)□ | Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p | priority under 3 | 35 U.S.C. | § 119(a)-(d) or (f). |
| a) [| ☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of: | | | |
| | 1. \square Certified copies of the priority documents ha | ve been receiv | /ed. | |
| | 2. \square Certified copies of the priority documents ha | ıve been receiv | ed in Apr | olication No |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority of application from the International Bure | reau (PCT Rule | 17.2(a)). | _ |
| _ | ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the | | | |
| 14)∐_ | Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic | | | |
| a) [| | * * | | |
| | Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic | c priority under | r 35 U.S.(| C. §§ 120 and/or 121. |
| Attachm | | | - 194 | |
| \sim | otice of References Cited (PTO-892) | | | 0-413) Paper No(s) |
| | otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | | nformal Patent | tt Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) [X] III | commation Disclosure Statement(s) (P10-1449) Paper No(s), | 6) Uther: | | |

Art Unit: 2682

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to applicant's response filed on 8/12/03. Claims 1-20 are now pending in the present application. **This action is made final.**

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The references listed in the information disclosure statements submitted on 8/28/03 has been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-8, 11, 13-14, 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Lekvena (PCT Pub. Number WO 00/25501) in view of Shaughnessy et al (US Pat. Number 5,928,325).

Regarding claim 1, Lekvena discloses a graphic user interface for a wireless communication device (cellular phone, see col. 1, lines 8-9) for simultaneously displaying a plurality of graphic images (picture files) associated with telephone numbers (see Abstract, Figs. 3-4 and col. 9, lines 9-20), comprising:

Art Unit: 2682

- receiving a plurality of picture files as claimed (see col. 6, line 32 - col. 7, line 5 and col. 12, lines 32-36);

- storing a plurality of picture files as claimed (see col. 7, lines 1-5);
- displaying a plurality of picture files as claimed (see Figs. 3-4 and col. 9, lines 9-20);
- downloading picture files based upon input from a user entered remote from said cellular phone (see col. 12, line 32 col. 13, line 12);

However, **Lekvena** fails to disclose the downloading is performed by way of a telecommunication network. However, since **Lekvena** disclose the picture files are downloaded from a computer, and since sending/receiving email messages including digital images for cellular phones are known in the art as disclosed by **Shaughnessy** (see col. 6, lines 18-24), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the above teachings of **Shaughnessy** into **Lekvena** for downloading digital images using email messages as well, for eliminating the need of a physical connection such as input interfaces. Here, by updating picture files associated with telephone numbers via email messages from a computer, the display of picture files would be changed in accordance with updated picture files, this would read on the limitation of changing the display of picture files by way of a telecommunication network as claimed.

Regarding claim 11, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, since Lekvena as modified would disclose the picture files are received in an e-mail message, it is clear that such email message is delivered to the cellular phone via the

Serial Number: 10/004,318

Page 4

Art Unit: 2682

telecommunication network of its service provider, this would read on the limitation "by way of a service provider" as claimed.

Regarding claim 16, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, since downloading images or information on Internet to a computer from a website of an information service provider is well known in the art of World Wide Web, and since any downloaded image of interest could be used by the user in Lekvena's reference for sending this image from the computer to the cellular phone via emails, for displaying the downloaded image with some associated telephone numbers as well (i.e, a scene of the Rocky Mountain in Colorado could be used for displaying with phone numbers having area code 303), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above teachings of Shaughnessy and Lekvena for downloading digital images to the cellular phone from Internet Websites for providing a method as claimed, for obtaining images of interest from Internet for entertainments.

Regarding claims 2-4, the claims are interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 5, 12, it is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1, 11 above. In addition, **Lekvena** discloses a circuit for downloading picture files from a remote device by a wireless (RF) protocol from telecommunication networks (see col. 7, lines 1-5);

Regarding claims 6, 13, 18, they are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1, 11, 16 above. In addition, since sending/receiving a picture or file as an attachment to an e-mail message is well known, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

Art Unit: 2682

the invention was made to further modify the above teachings of **Lekvena** and **Shaughnessy** for downloading picture files as an attachment to an email message as well, so that the picture files could be effectively saved into a memory at user's choice.

Regarding claims 7, 17, they are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, it is clear that when receiving an updated picture file for an associated phone number, the updated picture file would be displayed with other picture files in the GUI as shown in Figs. 3-4 of **Lekvena**'s reference.

Regarding claims **8**, **14**, **19**, they are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim **1** above. In addition, **Lekvena** discloses displaying content information (telephone numbers) with picture files (see col. 9, lines 9-20 and col. 13, lines 22-34).

4. Claims 1-6, 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Rossmann (US Pat. Number 5,809,415) in view of Wells (US Pat. Number 5,870,683).

Regarding claims 1, 10, Rossmann discloses a method for allowing a communication device such as cellular phones being able to access and retrieve information or application programs stored at a remote computer server of a service provider (see Figs. 1, 5 and col. 3, line 25 - col. 6, line 67). Although Rossmann fails to disclose the retrieving of a program that displays a plurality of picture files on the cellular phone, it is noted that a program that displays a plurality of picture files (i.e, animation sequences) such as a screen saver program is well known in the art as disclosed by Wells (see graphical information sequences GIS in Abstract, Figs. 3A - 4C and col. 3, line 54 - col. 10, line 55). Further, since accessing a remote server from a

Art Unit: 2682

computer for reconfiguring an application program is well known, and since Rossmann discloses application programs are stored at remote computer servers which are accessible from several telecommunication networks such as WAN, Internet (see Figs. 1, 5), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teaching of Wells to Rossmann for providing a screen saver program for displaying a plurality of picture files (graphical information sequences GIS) as claimed for user's entertainment, and further modifying Wells and Rossmann for remotely accessing the screen saver program from a computer to replace or select new GIS for the screen saver program as well, for utilizing advantages provided by the computer keyboards when changing images of the GIS of the screen saver program. Therefore, by remotely accessing the screen saver program from a computer to replace (or updating) the GIS of the screen saver program, the plurality of picture files (or graphical information sequences GIS) would be changed based upon input from a user entered remote from the cellular phone by way of a telecommunication network as claimed.

Regarding claims 11, 16, the claims are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, since **Rossmann** disclose the computer server is located at a website of a service provider (see Fig. 5), **Rossmann** as modified would disclose the plurality of picture files (or graphical information sequences GIS) would be changed based upon input from a user entered remote from the cellular phone by way of a website of a service provider as claimed.

Regarding claims 2-5, 12, they are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, since sending/receiving email messages including digital images for cellular phones are known in the art (Official Notice), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill

Art Unit: 2682

in the art at the time the invention was made to further modifying **Wells** and **Rossmann** for downloading or receiving a picture file from email as claimed, for utilizing advantages provided by e-mail protocol format, whereas it is clear that such email message would employ a wired protocol of the computer LAN and a wireless protocol of the cellular network.

Regarding claims 6, 13, 18, they are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 2, 11, 16 above. In addition, since sending/receiving a picture or file as an attachment to an e-mail message is well known, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the above teachings of Wells and Rossmann for downloading picture files as an attachment to an email message as well, so that the picture files could be effectively saved into a memory at user's choice.

Regarding claims 8, 14, 19, they are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1, 11, 16 above. In addition, it is clear that **Rossmann** as modified would disclose displaying content information with picture file (see Wells, col. 3, line 54 - col. 4, line 10).

Regarding claims 9, they are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1 above. In addition, it is clear that **Rossmann** as modified would disclose a user interface and program for enabling display of a predetermined picture file (see **Wells**, Fig. 1, ref. 22, col. 3, line 25 - col. 4, line 10, col. 10, lines 3-25).

Regarding claims 10, 15, 17, 20, the claims are interpreted and rejected for the same reason as set forth in claims 1, 11, 16 above.

Art Unit: 2682

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- **Henrick** (US Patent Number 5,940,752), Arrangement for remotely programming a cellular telephone terminal.

Art Unit: 2682

- **Amin** (US Patent Number 6,567,671), Wireless communication device with call screening.

- Rutledge (US Patent Number 6,205,321), Pager having voice synthesis capability and method for using the same.
- **Pepe et al** (PCT Pub. Number WO 97/33421), Personal communications internetworking.

8. Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box A.F.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc M. Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-4531, Monday-Thursday (9:00 AM - 5:00 PM). Or to Edward Urban (Supervisor) whose telephone number is (703) 305-4385.

Art Unit: 2682

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Duc M. Nguyen

Oct 17, 2003